

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed October 25, 2007, submitted concurrently with a two month extension of time to extend the due date for response to March 25, 2008.

By this Amendment, claims 1-4 have been amended to more particularly define the present invention. In view of such amendments, claim 20 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to its underlying subject matter. Thus, claims 1-19 and 21-31 are currently pending in this application. Support for the claim amendments can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims, see paragraph [0083] of the specification, and particularly the plasticizer content of the second polyvinyl acetal resin layer (A) and (B) described as the range of 30 to 45 parts by weight and 10 to 40 parts by weight, respectively, in paragraph [0083] of the specification.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wong et al. (WO 03/097347) in view of JP 10-045438, JP 2000-319044, JP 09-156967, JP 07-097240 and JP 05-104687. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Further, the prior art reference(s) in combination must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Here, in this case, Applicant believes that Wong et al., in combination with JP 10-045438, JP 2000-319044, JP 09-156967, JP 07-097240 and JP 05-104687, fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of the claims with particular emphasis on the newly added limitations “*the plasticizer content of the second polyvinyl acetal resin layer (A) is generally in the range of 30-45 parts by weight, the plasticizer content of the second polyvinyl acetal resin layer (B) is generally in the range of 10-40 parts by*

weight”, and “the plasticizer content (A)/plasticizer content (B) is in the range of 1.0-3, wherein the plasticizer content (A) is a plasticizer content of the first polyvinyl acetal resin layer (A) and the plasticizer content (B) is a plasticizer content of the second polyvinyl acetal resin layer (B)”.

Applicant believes that the present invention defined in amended claims 1 to 4 is not taught or suggested in the cited references. Wong et al. discloses a laminate article comprising two layers of soft PVB sheet and stiff PVB layer whereby penetration resistance can be enhanced. However, the claimed resin layer containing the co-acetalized resin is not disclosed nor suggested in Wong et al. In addition, the other cited references JP 10-045438, JP 2000-319044, JP 09-156967, JP 07-097240 and JP 05-104687 also do not disclose the ranges of the plasticizer content in the co-acetalized resins recited in amended claims 1 to 4.

The important feature of the present invention is that the particular co-acetalized resin layer allows the penetration resistance to be enhanced over a wide temperature range from a low temperature to a high temperature, as described in the paragraphs [0089] and [0090] of the specification. Such a feature of the present invention is not at all disclosed or suggested in any of cited references, Wong et al., JP 10-045438, JP 2000-319044, JP 09-156967, JP 07-097240 and JP 05-104687. Accordingly, the problems solved by the present invention and the unexpected and superior results obtained in the present invention are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references. As the Examiner already knows, a showing of superior and unexpected properties can rebut a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963).

In addition, in these cited references, the laminate including the PVB layer containing not more than 50 parts by weight of the plasticizer is not disclosed. For the Examiner's reference and convenience, Applicant has outlined the plasticizer contents in the cited references in the table below.

	Content of Plasticizer in Resin Layer (A)
JP'438	50 Parts by Weight in All Examples
JP'044	50 Parts by Weight in Examples 1-4 * Examples 5 and 6 use butyl aldehyde (number of carbon atoms: 4)
JP'967	50 Parts by Weight in Example 2
JP'240	50 Parts by Weight in All Examples
JP'687	Using Octyl aldehyde (number of carbon atoms: 8)

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all the limitations and superior features of claims 1-4 as amended and described above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such combination would not result in the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1-4 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 5-19 and 21-31 depend from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Further, Applicant asserts that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: March 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:  _____

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

CHENG LAW GROUP PLLC

1100 17th Street, N.W.

Suite 503

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 530-1280

Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4422 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.